

In the Drawings:

Please amend the drawings as in the attached markup sheets and replacement sheets to include English wording thereon.

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 2-4 are present in the application. Claim 4 is amended.

In the advisory action, the Examiner notes that English translations of the drawings are needed. Amendments to the drawings are made here to include English.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner notes that 'the' pseudo-fluidized bed is indefinite because of use of 'the'. The claim is amended to change the reference to 'a' pseudo-fluidized bed.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Letechin (WO 02/14412 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses.

The term "pseudo-fluidized bed" is strictly determined and contemplates the characteristics of running a process, moreover, the process of recycling rubber-containing wastes. This concept as broadly understood is clear to one skilled in art in the sphere of running processes in pseudo-fluidized bed mode. At this, there are no indications to running the process in conditions shown in the application and in the determined

regimes for the person skilled in the sphere of running the process of recycling rubber-containing wastes.

The Big Soviet Encyclopedia reads as follows:

"FLUIDIRATION, conversion of a layer of discrete material under the influence of upward-flowing gases or liquids, or other physical and mechanical influences into a system, solid particles of which are in suspension, and being analogous to liquid by the features, - pseudo-fluidized bed. Due to similarity of appearance with boiling liquid fluid bed is often named "boiling bed". In English-speaking literature this term is named "fluid bed" and the process is named "fluidiration".

Taking the aforesaid into consideration applicant amends the wrongly translated term "pseudo-fluidized bed" to "fluid bed".

The applicant asks to draw the Examiner's attention to that in Letechin's invention solvent does not interact with rubber-containing wastes in conditions of fluid bed. Therefore, a main difference of the claimed method from Letechin's application and all the documents cited by the Examiner is that the process of exact thermo fluidizing and thermolysis of crushed wastes (rubber crumb) is FIRST realized in FLUID bed of a solvent.


It is respectfully submitted that this difference is non-obvious and that applicant's claims are patentable.

Taking all the aforesaid into consideration the applicants asks the Examiner to consider the above arguments and grant the patent for the application.

The Examiner is asked to contact applicant's attorney at 503-224-0115 if there are any questions.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this filing in that the required fees are being submitted herewith. However, if additional fees are required to keep the application pending, please charge deposit account 503036. If fee refund is owed, please refund to deposit account 503036.

Respectfully submitted,




James H. Walters, Reg. No. 35,731


Customer number 802
patenttm.us
P.O. Box 82788
Portland, Oregon 97282-0788 US
(503) 224-0115
DOCKET: V-323

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited as first class mail with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this June 23, 2009.




1/2



~~Фиг. 1~~
FIG. 1

Replace
with English

2/2



~~Фиг. 2~~

→ Replace with English